KENNETH G. PARKER (SBN 182911) kparker@tlpfirm.com 09 OCT 21 PM 2: 13 ROBERT G. LOEWY (SBN 179868) rloewy@tlpfirm.com CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA TEUTÓN, LOEWY & PARKER LLP 3121 Michelson Drive, Suite 250 DEPUTY Irvine, California 92612 Telephone: (949) 442-7100 5 Facsimile: (949) 442-7105 6 THOMAS F.A. HETHERINGTON* 7 tom.hetherington@emhllp.com JARRETT E. ĞANER* 8 jarrett.ganer@emhllp.com EDISON, MCDOWELL & 9 HETHERINGTON LLP 3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2920 10 Houston, Texas 77027 Telephone: (713) 337-5580 Facsimile: (713) 337-8850 11 * pro hac vice motion to be filed 12 13 Attorneys for PHL VÁRIABLE INSURANCE CO. 14 UNITED STATES ISTRICT COURT 15 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 16 POR Case 78. CV 2 34 4 PHL VARIABLE INSURANCE CO., 18 Plaintiff, PLAINTIFF PHL VARIABLE INSURANCE COMPANY'S 19 ORIGINAL COMPLAINT V. 20 CLIFTON WRIGHT FAMILY INSURANCE TRUST, by and through 21 its trustee, VINCENT M. GIORDANO Action Filed: 22 Defendant. 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT

PHL Variable Insurance Company, by and through its attorneys, files this Original Complaint against the Clifton Wright Family Insurance Trust by and through its Trustee, Vincent M. Giordano as follows:

I.

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff PHL Variable Insurance Company ("Phoenix") is a Connecticut insurance company authorized to transact the business of insurance in California. Phoenix is a citizen of Connecticut within the meaning and intent of 28 U.S.C. § 1332.
- 2. Defendant, the Clifton Wright Family Insurance Trust ("Trust"), is a trust organized under the laws of California and is a citizen of California within the meaning and intent of 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The Trust may be served through its Trustee, Vincent M. Giordano ("Trustee"), at his home address, 12350 Lemon Crest Dr., Lakeside, California 92040. On information and belief, Trustee Giordano is the only trustee and is a resident of California.

II.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. This Court has jurisdiction over all parties of this lawsuit under 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) because Phoenix and Defendant are citizens of different states, and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of attorneys' fees, interests and costs. Defendant is subject to the personal jurisdiction of this Court.
- 4. This Court has jurisdiction for the declaratory judgment action pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 57 and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, which grant the United States District Courts jurisdiction to declare the "rights and other legal relations of any interested party making such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought."

3

4

6

5

8

9

7

10 11

12 13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24 25

26

27

28

Venue is proper for this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391, since the Trust is a citizen of California, its Trustee is located in San Diego County, and the insurance policy at issue is governed by California law.

III.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 6. Phoenix is, and during all relevant times has been, in the business of underwriting and issuing policies of life insurance and is authorized to transact the business of insurance in the State of California
- .7. The Trust, by and through its Trustee, applied in writing to Phoenix seeking the issuance of an insurance policy, insuring the life of Clifton Wright (the The Trust documents that were later provided to Phoenix "Application"). indicated that the intended beneficiary of Wright's insurance trust was his "best friend," Janice Hom.
- In completing this Application, Wright and the Trust provided Phoenix with material information regarding, among other things, Wright's net Specifically, the Trust responded to clear, direct worth and annual income. questions seeking material information regarding Wright's net worth and annual income. In response to these questions, the Application represented that Wright had a net worth of \$9,640,356 and annual unearned income of \$391,525. As discussed more fully in the ensuing paragraphs, these representations were false and were each material to Phoenix's acceptance of the risk assumed.
- 9. Additionally, during the application process, Wright and the Trust represented that the life insurance was being sought for "estate conservation." This statement was false and was material to Phoenix's acceptance of the risk assumed.
- 10. In completing the Application, Wright and the Trust knew that each was required to provide complete, accurate and honest answers to the questions presented on the Application. Wright and the Trust also knew that Phoenix would

11. The Application contained the following affirmation:

I have reviewed this application and the statements made herein are those of the proposed insured and all such statements made by the proposed insured in Part I or and in Part II of this application are full, complete, and true to the best knowledge and belief of the undersigned and have been correctly recorded.

Wright and the Trust, through its trustee at the time, executed the Application on September 25, 2007.

- 12. On the basis of the statements and representations on the Application and in reliance upon Wright's and the Trust's complete candor, honesty and openness in disclosing information in the response to the questions presented on the Application, Phoenix issued life insurance policy number 97524655 (the "Policy") to the Trust, with an effective date of October 22, 2007. The Policy's death benefit is \$6,000,000.
- 13. After some suspicion was raised concerning Wright's actual financial worth, Phoenix requested documents from Wright, the Trustee, and the insurance agent who sold the Policy in order to substantiate the financial representations as true and correct. In response to these requests, the only documents that Phoenix received was a copy of the trust agreement and a one page document reiterating the financial assertions made in the Application. In addition, Phoenix's own independent investigation did not reveal any basis on which a person could reasonable conclude that Wright had a net worth of \$9,640,356 and annual unearned income of \$391,525 on the date of the Application. Phoenix asserts that the statements made during the application process with respect to Wright's net worth, annual income, source of funding and purpose for the life insurance were each materially incorrect and/or fraudulent.

- 14. Had Wright and the Trust provided accurate responses on the Application regarding these items, Phoenix would not have issued the Policy or would have done so on materially different terms. As a result of the Policy's issuance, Phoenix has suffered damages, including but not limited to commissions Phoenix paid to its sales representatives that it would not have paid, but for the sale.
- 15. Phoenix brings this action seeking rescission of the Policy and an order declaring the Policy void *ab initio*.

IV.

COUNT I: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT: RESCISSION DUE TO MATERIAL MISREPRESENTATIONS

- 16. Phoenix incorporates herein by reference each of its allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-15 above.
- 17. Pursuant to the federal Declaratory Judgment Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Phoenix seeks a declaratory judgment that the Policy is null, void and rescinded *ab initio* due to the fraudulent and/or material misrepresentations and omissions that Wright and the Trust made on the Application, and that as a result of said rescission, Phoenix may deposit with the Clerk of the Court all premiums paid on the Policy along with required interests, if any, pending further dispensation by the Court.
- 18. Phoenix seeks a declaratory judgment that, pursuant to Section 483(c) of the California Insurance Code, the Trust is not entitled to a return of the Policy premiums due to actual fraud. Alternatively, Phoenix seeks a declaration judgment that Phoenix be allowed to offset from the Policy premiums an amount equal to the commissions paid to its agents or sale representative arising out of or relating to the sale of the Policy, other costs associated with the Policy, as well as its attorneys' fees and expenses.

- 19. Phoenix also seeks its fees pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Statute.
- 20. To the extent required by law, Phoenix fully and unconditionally tenders the Policy's premiums to the Court's registry.

V.

COUNT II: DECLARATORY JUDGMENT: RESCISSION - LACK OF INSURABLE INTEREST

- 21. Phoenix incorporates herein by reference each of its allegations contained in Paragraphs 1-20 above.
- 22. Pursuant to the federal Declaratory Judgment Statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, Phoenix seeks a declaratory judgment that the Policy is null, void and rescinded *ab initio* due to the lack of insurable interests. Wright and the Trust made statements, declarations and representations that were untrue relative to the insurable interests in Wright's life. The Policy's purchase was done to benefit Janice Hom, or in the alternative, an undisclosed third party, both of whom lacked the requisite insurable interest in Wright's life at the time of issuance. The Policy's issuance violates the letter and spirit of the state law on insurable interests and is inconsistent with the public policy of prohibiting the wagering on the lives of others. The application for and the purported ownership of the Policy by the Trust is merely a sham transaction intended to circumvent and violate applicable insurable interest laws and public policy. The Policy is, therefore, void *ab initio* and is of no force and effect from its inception.
- 23. Phoenix seeks a declaratory judgment that the Policy is null, void and rescinded *ab initio* due to the lack of insurable interest and that as a result of said rescission, Phoenix may deposit with the clerk of the Court all premiums paid on the Policy along with required interest, if any, pending further dispensation by the Court.

- 24. Phoenix seeks a declaratory judgment that, pursuant to Section 483(c) of the California Insurance Code, the Trust is not entitled to a return of the Policy premiums due to actual fraud. Alternatively, Phoenix seeks a declaration judgment that Phoenix be allowed to offset from the Policy premiums an amount equal to the commissions paid to its agents or sale representative arising out of or relating to the sale of the Policy, other costs associated with the Policy, as well as its attorneys' fees and expenses.
- 25. Phoenix also seeks its fees pursuant to the Declaratory Judgment Statute.
- 26. To the extent required by law, Phoenix fully and unconditionally tenders the Policy's premiums to the Court's registry.

VI.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, due to the above-reference fraudulent and/or material misrepresentations, Phoenix demands judgment against the Clifton Wright Family Insurance Trust as follows:

- (a) an order declaring and adjudging the Policy of life insurance bearing Policy Number 97524655 to be null and void and rescinded, *ab initio*;
- (b) an order that Phoenix deposit with the Clerk of the Court all premiums paid on the Policy along with the required interest, if any;
- (c) an order that that the Clerk of Court return to Phoenix all of the premiums deposited with the Court or, alternatively, an order that the Clerk of the Court pay to Phoenix from the premiums deposited an amount equal to: 1) the commissions paid by Phoenix to the agents or sale representative arising out of or relating to the sale of the Policy; and 2) any damages incurred by Phoenix as a result of the Policy's

issuance and subsequent investigation, including attorneys' fees and 1 2 expenses; 3 An order awarding cost of suit and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant (d) to the Federal Declaratory Judgment Statute; and 4 5 An order awarding such other relief as the Court deems equitable and (e) just to Phoenix. 6 7 TEUTON, LOEWY & PARKER LLP Dated: October 21, 2009 ROBERT G. LOEWY 8 KENNETH G. PARKER 9 By: 10 Kenneth G. Parker Attorneys for Plaintiff 11 PHL VÁRIABLE INSURANCE CO. 12 OF COUNSEL: 13 EDISON, McDowell & Hetherington LLP Thomas F.A. Hetherington, Texas Bar No. 24007359 Jarrett E. Ganer, Texas Bar No. 24055520 14 15 Phoenix Tower 16 3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2920 Houston, Texas 77027 (713) 337-5580 (Telephone) (713) 337-8850 (Facsimile) 17 18 E-mail: tom.hetherington@emhllp.com E-mail: jarrett.ganer@emhllp.com 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

COMPLAINT

Case 3:09-cv-02344-BTM-POR Document 1. Filed 10/21/09 Page 9 of 10

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	OF THE FORM.)		Some Board		
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS.			
PHL VARIABLE INSURANCE CO.	CLIFTON WRIGHT FAMILY INSURANCE TRUST, by and through its trustee 21/10/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/21/				
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Con	County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendanting T	California		
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES	County of Residence of First Listed Defendants: T California CLERK. U. SINDIS PRESENTATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.				
(a) Anamaria (fil a)		Attornous (Id M.J)	DEPUTY	,	
(c) Attorney's (Finn Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Kenneth G. Parker, Esq., Teuton, Loewy & Pa 3121 Michelson Dr. #250, Irvine, CA 92612; 94		Att 709 CV 2	344 BTM	POR	
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in On			RINCIPAL PARTIES	Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintif	
☐ 1 U.S. Government ☐ 3 Federal Question . Plaintiff (U.S. Government Not a		for Diversity Cases Only) P of This State			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of	· .	en of Another State	2		
• •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	en or Subject of a reign Country	3	□ 6 □ 6	
IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)					
CONTRACT TORTS ▼ 110 Insurance PERSONAL INJURY		ORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY 1 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES	
☐ 120 Marine ☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 315 Airplane Product	362 Personal Injury - ☐ 626 Med. Malpractice 365 Personal Injury - ☐ 626	0 Agriculture 0 Other Food & Drug 5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 0 Liquor Laws	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 ☐ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS	□ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust ; □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation	
& Enforcement of Judgment I 151 Medicare Act I 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine PE	Injury Product 🗖 650	0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs. 0 Occupational Safety/Health	☐ 820 Copyrights ☐ 830 Patent ☐ 840 Trademark	 □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations □ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV 	
	370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending	0 Other LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	☐ 810 Selective Service ☐ 850 Securities/Commodities/	
□ 160 Stockholders' Suits □ 190 Other Contract □ 195 Contract Product Liability □ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability □ 360 Other Personal	Property Damage 385 Property Damage 720	0 Fair Labor Standards Act 0 Labor/Mgmt, Relations 0 Labor/Mgmt, Reporting	☐ 861 HIA (1395ff) ☐ 862 Black Lung (923) ☐ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) ☐ 864 SSID Title XVI	Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 890 Other Statutory Actions	
□ 196 Franchise Injury REAL PROPERTY CIVIL RIGHTS PROPERTY	RISONER PETITIONS D 740	& Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS	☐ 891 Agricultural Acts ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization Act	
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 442 Employment ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 443 Housing/		0 Other Labor Litigation 1 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or Defendant)	☐ 893 Environmental Matters ☐ 894 Energy Allocation Act ☐ 895 Freedom of Information Act	
□ 290 All Other Real Property □ 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment □	550 Civil Rights	IMMIGRATION 2 Naturalization Application 3 Habeas Corpus -	•	© 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice	
Other 440 Other Civil Rights	555 Prison Condition	Alien Detainee 5 Other Immigration Actions	e	☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
	nanded from	stated of Li J anotha	Ferred from 6 Multidistrict Litigation	Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
Cite the U.S. Civil Statute 28 U.S.C. \$ 1332	under which you are filing (I			Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION Brief description of cause: Declaratory Judgm	nent - Rescission due	to material misrep	presentations		
VII. REQUESTED IN CHECK IF THIS IS A UNDER F.R.C.P. 23		EMAND S		if demanded in complaint: ☐ Yes ✓ No	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY (See instructions): JUI	(See instructions):		DOCKET NUMBER		
	SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY	PRECORD			
10/21/2009	C		_		
RECEIPT # 6551 AMOUNT 350.00	APPLYING IFP	JUDGE	MAG. JUD	oge .	
CRMS 10/4/09			/		

Court Name: USDC California Southern

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CASO06551 Cashier ID: msweaney

Transaction Date: 10/21/2009
Payer Name: NORCO DELIVERY SVCS

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: PHL INS V CLIFTON WRIGHT TRUST Case/Party: D-CAS-3-09-CV-002344-001

Amount: \$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: 20549 Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00

Total Tendered: \$350.00 Change Amt: \$0.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.